

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

REMARKS

Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on August 23, 2005. The Examiner has rejected independent claim 1 due to some informalities. *See* Office Action at Page 3. The Examiner has also rejected claims 2, 4, 10, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. *See id.* The Examiner further rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Admitted Prior Art (Specification Paragraphs 4-7) in view of Castore et al (USP 5,712,706). *See id.* at Pages 3-6.

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-18 remain pending in the present application. More specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 8-10, 12, 15-16 have been amended and claims 6 and 13 have been canceled. *See infra* at Pages 2-4. It is believed that the foregoing amendments and additions add no new matter to the present application.

Response to Objections Based on Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Applicant has deleted claims 6 and 13 so that the element of the "integrated sphere" has been deleted. No amendment is now considered necessary on the drawings. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Section No. 1

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

Response to Objections Based on Informalities

The Office Action rejected claim 1 because of the informalities of "disposedon."

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended so that the misspellings of "disposedon" have been replaced by "disposed on." See *infra* at Pages 2-3. Applicants believe that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance.

Response to Objections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 4, 10, 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claims 2, 4, 10, 12 have been amended from the use of "and/or" to "and" in order to clarify the subject matter of the invention. Applicants wish to clarify that foregoing amendments of claim 1 have been made for purposes of better defining the invention in response to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and not in response to the rejections made based on prior art. Applicants believe that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Response to Objections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art in view of Castore (USP 5,712,706).

The Examiner cites Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Castore as

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

rendering the invention obvious, thereby rejecting claims 1-18. *See* Office Action at Pages 3-4. Although AAPA teaches the manual setup to measure the optoelectric properties of an OLED and Castore teaches a non-contact measurement device that allows automated collection of data and movement of various parts, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine AAPA with Castore to reach the present invention. For the reasons below, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of AAPA in view of Castore is legally deficient for rendering claims 1-18 obvious for the reason that the combination does not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claims at issue.

First, Castore's system contains a laser distance measuring apparatus instead of a photo-detector like the present invention. This difference is significant because Castore's invention seeks to measure the thread form of a thread, producing data such as the root radius, pitch, helix angle, diameter, surface roughness, etc. by bouncing laser off various places on the thread and measuring the deflected laser. *See* Castore Col. 4, Lines 23-28 and 62-64. The thread does not self-emit light but only deflects the laser that has been fired at it. In contrast, the present invention is measuring the optoelectric properties of the OLED, which is a light-emitting device (as shown by its name), by detecting the light it sends off. *See* Specification Paragraph 6. Hence, a photo-detector, rather than a laser scanner or another light-emitter, is included in the present invention. This difference of OLED being a light-emitting device is emphasized by dependent claims 7-8 and 14-15, which seek to measure more properties of the OLED by connecting and controlling the OLED with a power supply and a current driver. In contrast, the thread being

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

scanned does not emit light, therefore it would be unnecessary to connect it to a power supply or a current driver.

The second reason that the combination of references does not render the invention obvious is that the present invention adds that the goniometer can rotate and tilt while Castore's goniometer can only rotate. *See* Specification Paragraph 21, Claims 2 and 10; Castore Col. 4, Lines 57-62 and Col. 6, Lines 27-33. Because Castore is trying to obtain the accurate thread form of the thread, Castore may desire the thread to rotate along the Y-axis so that the entire thread form can face the photo-detector during the measurement operation. However, Castore would not teach that the thread rotates or tilts with respect to the X and Z axis, both of which may turn the thread away from the laser scanner or create a different deflection of the laser rays that may consequently distort the thread form. Hence, although Castore teaches that both the goniometer and the laser scanner can move, his examples, figures, and goals teach that the goniometer should only move in the way to rotate along the Y-axis. *See* Castore Col. 6, lines 3-33, and Figures 2-3. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine AAPA and Castore to obtain the present invention. Consequently, the combination of AAPA in view of Castore does not render independent claims 1 and 9 obvious, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Since claims 2-6, 7-12, 14-18 are dependent claims, which further define the invention recited in claim 1 or 9, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectively

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

requested. Favorable consideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9705-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,648

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the presently pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: Nov. 14. 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw